

request for the suppression of the specific name *tricolor* [Z.N.(S.) 1102] being acceded to. This point is discussed in my comment on that application below.

In conclusion, I support the following proposals of Dr. Lemche in the present application, and recommend their approval by the International Commission: (1) (b) (i), (ii) and (iii), (2) (b); (3) (a), (b), (c) and (d), though the last two I would consider unnecessary if (1) (b) (i) is accepted; (4); (5) (a) (i), (ii) and (iii); (5) (b), (c), (d) and (e); and (6) (b). For the rest, I beg leave to lay the following alternative proposals before the Commission for their consideration:

- (1) to use the plenary powers:
  - (a) to validate the probable vernacular usage of the name "*tergipes*" in a generic sense by Cuvier, 1805;
  - (b) to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
    - (i) *dicquemari* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes dicquemari*;
    - (ii) *brochi* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes brochi*;
- (2) to place the family-group name CUTHONIDAE Odhner, 1934 (type-genus *Cuthona* Alder & Hancock, 1855), on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology [but without a grant of precedence over TERGIPIDIDAE];
- (3) to place the generic name *Tergipes* Cuvier, 1805 (gender : masculine) (validated under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above), type-species by monotypy *Limax tergipes* Forskål, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (4) to place the generic name *Tergipes* Risso, 1818 (a junior homonym of *Tergipes* Cuvier, 1805), on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
- (5) to place the following specific names, suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:
  - (a) *dicquemari* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes dicquemari*;
  - (b) *brochi* Risso, 1818, as published in the binomen *Tergipes brochi*.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *EUBRANCHUS* FORBES, 1838, WITH SUPPRESSION OF SEVERAL NOMINA DUBIA: Z.N.(S.) 1102

(see present volume, pages 40-44)

By David Heppell (Dept. of Zoology, The University, Glasgow, Scotland)

I should like to make an objection to the proposal to suppress the specific name *tricolor*, the sole original species of the genus *Eubbranchus*, and to the proposed consequent transfer of that generic name to a new concept based on a type-species hitherto considered by many authors not to be specifically distinct from *E. tricolor*. However convenient Dr. Lemche's proposals may be for Scandinavian zoologists, it is doubtful whether many British malacologists would consider that this is a case where the designation of a new type-species, with suppression of the name commonly in use hitherto, contributes anything towards the stability of accepted usage of the generic name. Of the genus *Eubbranchus*, Pruvot-Fol, 1954, says: "Un grand nombre d'espèces ont été attribuées à ce genre; mais seul la couleur servait à distinguer toutes celles d'Europe, sauf trois. Aujourd'hui on tend à en réunir la plupart en une seule espèce [*tricolor*] très variable (quant à la couleur seulement), aucune différence n'ayant pu être décelée dans leur anatomie, leur dentition, leur mâchoires; les diverses espèces sont trouvées de

compagnie et s'accouplent les unes avec les autres ainsi que cela a été observé plus d'une fois. Seule l'espèce *exigua* est vraiment distincte et mérite de former un genre ou sous-genre; en outre Eliot tient pour espèce distincte *E. vittata*." In fact, Pruvot-Fol recognises three "good" species of European *Eubbranchus*: *tricolor*, *vittatus* and *cingulatus*, *exigua* being placed in the genus *Capellinia* Trinchese, 1874. The nominal species *farrani* Alder & Hancock and *alberti* Quatrefages are considered by her to be synonymous with *tricolor*, while *pallida* is regarded as a variety of that species. Apart from *alberti*, three nominal species are involved in this issue: *tricolor* (the type-species of *Eubbranchus* by monotypy), *pallidus* and *farrani*. If Dr. Lemche's proposals are approved, *tricolor* will be suppressed in favour of the junior subjective synonym *viridula*—a name which has been used only by a few Scandinavian workers; *pallida* will be placed on the Official List in Z.N.(S.) 1044; and *farrani* will become the type-species under the plenary powers of a restricted genus, also bearing the name *Eubbranchus*, but which will not include its type-species as at present understood. This seems to me to be making "confusion worse confounded" rather than contributing to stability of nomenclature.

By many workers the taxon *pallidus* has been considered as a variety or sub-species of *tricolor* and so, as Dr. Lemche himself admits, has *farrani*. If legislation is adopted to make *tricolor* an invalid synonym of the type-species of *Egalvina*, and *farrani* the type of the reconstituted genus *Eubbranchus*, what name shall the worker use who considers *farrani* to be but a sub-species of *tricolor* (= *viridula*)—*Eubbranchus farrani viridula* or *Egalvina farrani viridula*?—or should he, for the sake of convenience but contrary to his taxonomic judgment, place his sub-species in separate genera? As Dr. Lemche does not mention the species *exigua* in this context, although he wishes it to be placed on the Official List in his previous application [Z.N.(S.) 1044], we do not know whether he considers it a "true *Eubbranchus*" or not, so we do not know whether the adoption of the genus *Capellinia* for that species has any bearing on the present problem. Contrary to the conclusions reached by Dr. Lemche, I consider that the resurrection of the name *Amphorina* would alleviate this problem rather than add to the existing confusion. Its sole original species *alberti* was published in the same month as *farrani* and these two names are generally considered to be conspecific. The plenary powers could be invoked to grant seniority to the name *farrani*, which would then become a senior subjective synonym of *alberti*, and the name *Amphorina* would become available for the group of *Eubbranchus farrani*, allowing *Eubbranchus* to be retained for *tricolor* if the genus is dismembered. *Amphorina* would of course be a junior subjective synonym of *Eubbranchus* for anyone considering *farrani* and *tricolor* to be congeneric.

In requesting that the family-group name EUBRANCHIDAE be placed on the Official List, Dr. Lemche gives its type-genus as *Eubbranchus* Forbes, 1838; if his proposals in this application are adopted, we might adapt one of his own expressions and state: "There is no *Eubbranchus* Forbes, 1838, only *Eubbranchus* Lemche, 1964!"

In conclusion, I should like to register my support for the following proposals in this case: (1) (b) (i); (1) (c) (i), (ii) and (iii); (4) (a) and (d); (5) (b) and (c); and (6). In place of the others, I beg leave to lay the following alternative proposals before the International Commission for their consideration:

- (1) to use the plenary powers to grant precedence to the specific name *farrani* Alder & Hancock, 1844, as published in the binomen *Eolis farrani*, over the specific name *alberti* Quatrefages, 1844, as published in the binomen *Amphorina alberti*;
- (2) to place the generic name *Eubbranchus* Forbes, 1838 (gender : masculine), type-species by monotypy *Eubbranchus tricolor* Forbes, 1838, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (3) to place the specific name *tricolor* Forbes, 1838, as published in the binomen *Eubbranchus tricolor* (type-species of *Eubbranchus* Forbes, 1838) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.